

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Examiner is also thanked for the indication that claims 8-15 and 17-32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Examiner is also thanked for the indication that claims 33-49 are allowed. The Office Action dated October 17, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 7, and 8 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claim 6 is hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claim 4 was previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, and 7-49 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office rejects claims 1-3, 5-7, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent RE 14,964 to Anderson (hereafter *Anderson*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,530 to Borgen (hereafter *Borgen*). Claim 6 is canceled, so the rejection of claim 6 is moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 16

As required in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” *Anderson* and *Borgen*, either singularly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 16, and thus, cannot render these claims obvious.

Amended claim 1 recites, “the groove and projection are arranged to deviate from the rotation center of the leg bolt.” *Anderson* fails to teach or suggest at least this element of claim 1. In fact, *Anderson* discloses that the central pocket (20) and the tapered lower end portion (12d) are located at the rotation center of the leg (12). *See, Anderson*, Fig. 6.

Borgen fails to cure the deficiency in *Anderson* with respect to claim 1. Again, *Borgen* discloses that the spike (3) and the central depression (5') are located at the rotation center of the bolt (1). *See, Borgen*, Fig. 4. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of *Anderson* and *Borgen*. Claims 2-3, 5, 7, and 16, which variously depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, and 16.

CONCLUSION

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael N. August (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant